

Remarks

Claims 30 and 31 were allowed in the February 14, 2007 Office Action. Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-19 stand rejected as obvious. In view of the remarks below further consideration of claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-19 is respectfully requested.

Previously Allowed Subject Matter

Claims 30 and 31 were indicated to be allowed. Since they have not been amended by this response, they should remain allowed.

Art Rejections

The obviousness rejections are premised on two findings, both of which are respectfully traversed as follows:

1. The Office Action acknowledges the absence of relevant triangular teachings in the cited references. However, it asserts that one could use a rectangular device with a different positioning relative to the walls to achieve equivalent corner cleaning, and as a result does not give patentable weight to the distinction.

In response Applicants call the examiner's attention to the attached diagrammatic sheet. If the pad is positioned as in Fig. A (so that the pad isn't parallel to a wall but corner 2 acts as a leading corner), corner dirt 1 can't be reached at all. Reorienting the pad as in B would cause dirt 1 to be flattened adjacent the corner, not driven out of it. Orienting the pad as in C would then repetitively cram the dirt into the corner.

Hence, leading a rectangular pad with its front corner forward when the pad is not parallel to a corner wall will insure that the corner dirt can't be reached. Other positioning repetitively jams the dirt into a corner. Thus, the proposed combined teachings of the art don't lead to equivalent corner performance when compared to a generally triangular shape (which instead acts as a pick).

2. This alone should lead to the allowance of the remaining claims (in addition to claims 30 and 31 already allowed)). In any event, Applicants also wish to emphasize the inadequacies of the teachings of Kessel (which was relied on to suggest use of hook and loop material in a high speed motorized device).

For one thing, Kessel was largely focused on adhesive connecting systems. While it did mention the possibility of hook and loop connectors, it did not depict

how to implement that, and did not suggest that alternative when higher speeds were being used.

Even if one had cobbled together various pieces of Kessel as proposed, at most one might have considered placing hook and loop connectors under an entire rectangular pad. However, that still does not address Applicants' further argument that as a triangle narrows, it leaves less and less frame area available for the cleaning attachment to contact at the very area at the front which receives the greatest shear forces during cleaning in Applicants' device. Hence, Kessel would not motivate to one skilled in the art to apply hook and loop attachment principles to a framing around the packet, in the context of a high speed reciprocating of a triangular plate.

Conclusion

Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-19 and 30-31 are believed to be in allowable form. Confirmation of allowance of these claims is therefore respectfully requested.

No additional fees are believed necessary for consideration of this response. However, should any additional fees nevertheless be needed for full consideration of this amendment, please charge any fees believed necessary in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 10-0849 .

Respectfully submitted,

David C. Long, et al.

Dated: April 4, 2007

By: _____



Linda Blair Meier
Reg. No.: 39,769
Attorney For Applicant
S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.
1525 Howe Street , MS 077
Racine, Wisconsin 53403
(262) 260- 2474

